

# United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/830,719	08/01/2001	Rowan Nigel Naylor	29206-00036	3645	
7590 08/18/2005			EXAM	EXAMINER	
Stanley R Moore			MEONSKE, TONIA L		
Jenkens & Gilchrist Suite 3200			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
1445 Ross Avenue			2183		
Dallas, TX 75202-2799			DATE MAILED: 08/18/200:	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<u> </u>					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	09/830,719	NAYLOR, ROWAN NIGEL			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Tonia L. Meonske	2183			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appearing for Reply	pears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a rely within the statutory minimum of thirt will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON e, cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed  y (30) days will be considered timely.  THS from the mailing date of this communication.  ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 J	un <u>e 2005</u> .				
· <u> </u>	☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4)  Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray  5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6)  Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are rejected.  7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or					
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.				
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acc	epted or b)□ objected to t	by the Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	` '			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	·	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •			
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority document</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority document</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority</li> <li>application from the International Bureau</li> </ul>	s have been received. s have been received in Aprity documents have been	oplication No			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not	received.			
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview S	ummary (PTO-413)			
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s	)/Mail Date			
<ol> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)         Paper No(s)/Mail Date     </li> </ol>	5)  Notice of In	formal Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Application/Control Number: 09/830,719

Art Unit: 2183

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fu et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,226,127 (herein referred to as Fu).
- 3. Referring to claims 1 and 5 Fu has taught a processing arrangement for a computer, the arrangement comprising:
  - a. first processor means which is operable to process instructions from a first set of instructions (Fu column 6 lines 37-49); and
  - b. second processor means which is operable to process instructions from a second set of instructions, which second set of instructions is a subset of the first set of instructions (Fu column 6 lines 37-49, figure 1), the second processor means being arranged to receive instructions and to process the received instructions without reference to the first processor means, when the received instructions are selected from the second set of instructions (Fu column 6 line 36-column 8 line 5, figure 1), wherein the first processor means includes a plurality of registers, and the second processor means is operable to access a predetermined, non-zero, selection of the said registers (Fu column 3 lines 39-49; the floating point co-processor will affect the same registers that are affected by the general purpose processor, figure 1), and wherein the first and second processors

Application/Control Number: 09/830,719 Page 3

Art Unit: 2183

are operable to process respective instructions in parallel with one another (Column 3, line 50-column 4, line 7, When the main processor does not wait for the coprocessor to complete processing the respective instruction are executed in parallel.).

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 2-4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fu in view of Kawahara et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,614,847 (herein referred to as Kawahara).
- 6. Referring to claims 2 and 6 Fu has not taught an arrangement as claimed in claim 1, wherein the first processor means has active and inactive states of operation, and wherein the second processor means is operable to process instructions when the first processor means is in the inactive state.
- Kawahara has taught wherein the first processor means has active and inactive states of operation, and wherein the second processor means is operable to process instructions when the first processor means is in the inactive state (Kawahara column 31 lines 25-38). Allowing the coprocessor to have active and inactive states would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. By having the first processor, or coprocessor, in a sleep state, less power is dissipated so that the system uses less total power (Kawahara column 31 lines 25-38). This is especially useful for systems running off of batteries in a lap top computer, for example. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

Application/Control Number: 09/830,719 Page 4

Art Unit: 2183

the invention to allow the coprocessor to have active and inactive states so that when the coprocessor is idle and the general purpose processor is busy, less power is consumed by the system.

- 8. Referring to claim 3 the combination of Fu and Kawahara has taught an arrangement as claimed in claim 2, wherein the second processor means is operable to cause the first processor means to change to the active state from the inactive state, when the received instructions cannot be processed by the second processor means (Kawahara column 31 lines 25-38).
- 9. Referring to claim 4 the combination of Fu and Kawahara has taught a processing arrangement as claimed in any one of claims 1 to 3, composing a plurality of such second processor means for processing respective subsets of the first instruction set (Kawahara column 30 lines 17-34).

#### Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6 have been considered but are moot in view of the ground(s) of rejection detailed above.

#### Conclusion

- 11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tonia L. Meonske whose telephone number is (571) 272-4170. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, with every other Friday off.
- 12. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eddie P. Chan can be reached on (571) 272-4162. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2183

13. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

tlm

EDDIE CHAN

EDDIE CHAN

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100